

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WILLIAM G. SUTHERLAND,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:18-cv-13568

HONORABLE STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III

v.

PAT WARREN, et al.,

Defendants.

/

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [84], AND
DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION [74]**

Plaintiff William Sutherland is a pro se prisoner who has alleged various constitutional violations by Corizon Health, Inc., its employees, and employees of the Michigan Department of Corrections. ECF 15. The Court referred the matter to Magistrate Judge Elizabeth Stafford, and the parties filed several motions. At issue is Plaintiff's most recent motion for a preliminary injunction. ECF 74. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") and suggested the Court deny Plaintiff's motion. ECF 84. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) governs review of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation. De novo review of the magistrate judge's findings is required only if the parties "serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). Because neither party filed objections, de novo review of the Report's conclusions is not required. After reviewing the record, the Court finds that the magistrate judge's

conclusions are factually based and legally sound. The Court will therefore adopt the Report's findings and deny Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction.

Also pending is Plaintiff's motion to extend time to respond. ECF 75. But Plaintiff did not specify the pleading to which he needs to respond. And the only pending motions on the docket were filed after Plaintiff filed the motion for extension. The Court will therefore deny the motion as moot.

ORDER

WHEREFORE, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation [84] is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [74] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to File a Response [75] is **DENIED** as moot.

SO ORDERED.

s/Stephen J. Murphy, III
STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III
United States District Judge

Dated: December 22, 2020

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on December 22, 2020, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/David P. Parker
Case Manager